

REMARKS

Claim 13 has been amended. Claims 1, 3 to 8, 10 to 16, 18 to 27 and 29 remain active in this application.

Claims 1, 3 to 8, 10 to 16, 18 to 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Omura et al. publication in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 requires, among other steps, after generating video data representing video frames for forming the video image of object, processing the video data. No such procedure is taught or suggested by Omura et al.

Claim 1 further requires that the processing take place by first dividing each video frame into a plurality of regions, each region being representative of a portion of the object, at least one of the plurality of regions being predetermined at least one of the plurality of regions and the other of the plurality of regions being remaining ones of the plurality of regions. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 still further then requires the step of selecting the predetermined at least one of the plurality of regions of the video frame. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 yet further then requires the step of de-emphasising said remaining ones of the plurality of regions of the video frame. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 even further requires the step of transmitting video data indicative of the selected at least predetermined one and the remaining ones of the plurality of regions of the video frames to a receiver having a display for displaying the display video image. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 1 still further requires the step of then recombining the regions of each of the video frames to form a display video, the recombining step comprising forming a display video image in which the selected region of the video frame is sharp or well-defined, and remaining ones of the plurality of regions of the video frame are de-emphasised or blurred in accordance with the relative distance between the portion of said object in a remaining one of the plurality of regions respective region of said object and a reference point. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

The Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, whatever that may be and which is undetermined does not overcome the deficiencies in Omura et al. In fact, the only portion of Omura et al. which appears to be relied upon is Fig. 5(b) to which about 7 lines of text are attributed and which has nothing whatsoever to do with the process as claimed. The mere fact that an object can be viewed in front of a blurred background in no way is a teaching or suggestion of the process claimed.

Claims 3 to 8 and 10 to 15 depend from claim 1 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 1.

Claim 3 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of selecting the region comprise selecting a region defining a foreground object. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 4 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of selecting the region comprise an observer selecting a region of the object. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 5 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of selecting the region comprise selecting a region of the video frame according to the position of an object relative to at least one other object. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 6 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of selecting the region comprises selecting a region of the video frame defining an active entity. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 7 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of dividing the video image into a plurality of regions comprises dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 8 further limits claim 7 by requiring that the step of dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane comprise dividing the video image into regions wherein each focal plane is representative of a different distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such step is taught

or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 10 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of selecting at least a predetermined one of the plurality of regions comprise de-emphasising remaining portions of the video image according to the distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 11 further limits claim 10 by requiring that the step of de-emphasising remaining portions of said video image comprise applying greater de-emphasisation to regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a greater distance between the respective portion of the object and the reference point than regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a smaller distance between the respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 12 further limits claim 1 by requiring the step of artificially generating each remaining region of the video image. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 13 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of generating video data comprise monitoring an object with a video camera to produce one or more video frames.

No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 14 further limits claim 13 by requiring that the step of displaying the video image comprise displaying said video frame such that remaining regions of the display video image are less sharp in accordance with the relative distance between the respective portion of the object and the video camera. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 15 further limits claim 1 by requiring that the step of generating video data comprise generating a sequence of video frames, and the step of displaying the display video image comprises displaying a sequence of video frames. No such step is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 16 requires, among other steps, circuitry for dividing each video frame into a plurality of regions such that each region is representative of a portion of the object, at least one of the plurality of regions being predetermined at least one of the plurality of regions and the other of the plurality of regions being remaining ones of the plurality of regions. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 16 further requires means for selecting the at least one of the plurality of predetermined regions from the received video data. No such feature is taught or

suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 16 still further requires circuitry for recombining the regions of each of the video frames to form a display video image. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 16 yet further requires a display for displaying the video frames of the display video image such that the selected region is formed as a sharp image, and remaining regions of the display video image are less sharp in accordance with the relative distance between the respective portion of the object and a reference point. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In addition, as to claim 16, the arguments presented above with reference to claim 1 apply as well.

Claims 18 to 27 and 29 depend from claim 16 and therefore define patentably over the applied references for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 16.

In addition, claim 18 further limit claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged to select a region defining a foreground object. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 19 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged such that an observer can select a region of the monitored object. No such

feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 20 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged to select a region of the video frame according to the position of an object relative to at least one other object. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 21 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the means for selecting be arranged to select a region of the video frame defining an active entity. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 22 further limits claim 16 by requiring that the circuitry for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions be arranged for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 23 further limits claim 22 by requiring that the circuitry for dividing the video image into a plurality of regions each defining a focal plane be arranged for dividing the video image into regions wherein each focal plane being representative of a different distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 24 further limits claim 23 by requiring circuitry for de-emphasizing remaining regions of the display video image. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 25 further limits claim 24 by requiring that the de-emphasising circuitry be arranged for de-emphasising remaining portions of the video image according to the distance between a respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 26 further limits claim 25 by requiring that de-emphasising circuitry be arranged for applying greater de-emphasisation to regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a greater distance between the respective portion of the object and the reference point than regions of the video image that are representative of portions of the object having a smaller distance between the respective portion of the object and the reference point. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 27 further limits claim 24 by requiring means for artificially generating each remaining region of the video image. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claim 29 further limits claim 24 by requiring that the circuitry for generating video data comprise a video camera for monitoring an object to produce one or more

video frames and the display is capable of displaying the video frame such that remaining regions of the display video image are less sharp in accordance with the relative distance between said respective portion of the object and the video camera. No such feature is taught or suggested by Omura, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or any proper combination of these references either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)